

### **REMARKS**

This response is submitted in answer to the Examiner's Final Action dated May 8, 2003. Applicant has not amended the claims herein. Applicant provides arguments below, which addresses non-obvious features of both the independent claims and specific dependent claims. The dependent claim features may be incorporated into their respective independent claims, if necessary for allowance.

### **IN THE DRAWINGS**

At paragraph 2 of the Office Action, Examiner approves the proposed drawing corrections. Applicant thanks the Examiner for the approval.

### **CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

At paragraph 4 of the Office Action, Claims 5-7, 11-14, 19 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), as being unpatentable over Roderick (U.S. Patent No. 6,122,648). Roderick does not suggest the subject matter provided by Applicant's claims. In fact, Roderick fails to suggest several key features recited by Applicant's claims.

Applicant's independent claims recite: "means for **generating** a document identifier (ID) for said received E-commerce generated electronic document; ...; and means for **transmitting** said document **ID** to each party to said E-commerce transaction **that produced** said electronic document" (emphasis added). In addition, Applicant's dependent claims recite: "means for **preventing modifications** to said E-commerce generated electronic document **after** said document has been stored" (emphasis added).

Roderick does not suggest any of these claimed features. Examiner has incorrectly stated that Roderick discloses "means for ...generating the ID and transmitting the document to each client associated with each e-commerce transaction." However, that assertion is completely without merit and/or support.

Roderick discloses a method for "identifying, managing and delivering information content" (col. 2, line 26) from databases over a data network. The user provides an industry

standard product identifier to the server, which carries out the search and retrieval of the information from databases on the network. The retrieved information is utilized to create an information page for the information. However, the information page is neither stored, nor given a unique ID that identifies that specific user-initiated search that resulted in the generation of the information page. In fact, the process described by Roderick is not technically related to an e-commerce transaction that generates its own unique document(s), as that term (e-commerce) and process is understood by those skilled in the art and described by Applicant's invention. Roderick provides more of a search engine functionality, where the user enters the search term (industry standard product identifier) and receives search results displayed within a page.

Roderick specifically states on page 4, that the document identifier comprises "the industry standard product identifier" and at lines 54-65, Roderick provides a comprehensive description of his inventive features, i.e., "upon receiving... an industry standard product identifier... search for and retrieve ... information ..., and generates executable instructions to create the requested information page..."

It is clear that Roderick fails to suggest the key features of Applicant's invention within the (e-commerce) context of Applicant's invention. Applicant has reviewed the entire Roderick reference, and Roderick is devoid of any suggestion of the features of Applicant's invention. Should Examiner insist on the use of Roderick to support the 103 rejection, Applicant respectfully requests that Examiner point out the specific sections of Roderick that would lead one skilled in the art to conclude that Applicant's invention is unpatentable over Roderick.


For the above reasons, one skilled in the art would not find Applicant's invention obvious in light of Roderick. Applicant's claims are therefore allowable.

**CONCLUSION**

Applicant has diligently responded to the Final Office Action by explaining why the claims are not unpatentable over Roderick. The arguments overcome the §103 rejection, and Applicant, therefore, respectfully requests reconsideration of the rejections and issuance of a Notice of Allowance for all claims now pending.

Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner contact the undersigned attorney of record at (512) 542-2100 if such would further or expedite the prosecution of the present Application.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "E. Isidore", is written over a horizontal line.

Eustace P. Isidore

*Registered with Limited Recognition (see attached)*

BRACEWELL & PATTERSON, L.L.P.

P.O. Box 969

Austin, Texas 78767-0969

(512) 542-2100

ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANT(S)